UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,450	09/14/2006	Peter Kinsler	2946-1-001	1493
23565 KLAUBER & J	7590 06/24/200 JACKSON	EXAMINER		
411 HACKENS	SACK AVENUE	VERBITSKY, GAIL KAPLAN		
HACKENSAC	K, NJ 07001		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2855	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/553,450	KINSLER, PETER	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Gail Verbitsky	2855	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following r application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extractional extraction extractional extractional extractional extractional extractional extraction extraction extractional extraction	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u> 3.			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor 	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		L below),	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	**	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Americanient (i	10L-32+).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	·	imelv filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	•	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and 			
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a	Notice of Anneal but prior to the	date of filing a brief w	ill not be
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but applicant argues that the primary reference (Yata) canno			
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Gail Verbitsky/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2855	
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Applicant argues that a wine bottle is a special device which could not be substituted with a baby bottle. This argument is not persuasive, because there is lots of different wine and other bottles in the market: different shapes, color, size, etc., and the Applicant has never described the claimed wine bottle as different from the bottle used by Yata, other than the by the name. The Examiner's position is that the baby bottle, especially made of glass, could at some circumstances serve as a wine bottle. For example, if for some reason, some would fill it out with a wine. Since, it is known in the art that all beverages have the same range of usable temperature, the temperature sensor used with the baby bottle has the range appropriate to be used when the wine temperature is being measured.